be continued but it is very necessary that some furniture and a peon is granted to them.

Third Member of Council.—It was recommended by the Deputy Commissioner that the jurisdiction of the village munsiff's court near Malur may be extended over the villages within a radius of 5 miles. This was sanctioned. If the Deputy Commissioner of the District recommends any such case it may be considered.

Dewan.—It is not desirable to consider this question. Wherever competent men are forthcoming, Government will try to increase the number of courts.

SUBJECT No. 53.

Official control over Village Panchayet Members.

Mr. Hutchveeregowda, Gubbi Taluk.

Mr. Hutchveeregowda.—Some of these members are not properly working since there is no supervision. While the villages were under the supervision of the Amildars they were in very good condition in point of view of sanitation and cleanliness. These panchayet members are honorary workers and the Vice-President also an honorary worker, and as such no check can be exercised by any body. It is better if some responsible officer of Government is entrusted with this work.

Dewan.—What was the object of granting Local Self-Government to villages? The villagers must be responsible for all such work.

SUBJECT No. 54.

Powers of Bench Courts.

Messrs. (1) B. Srinivasa Iyengar and R. Subba Rao, Anekal Taluk; Gubbiah, Anekal Municipality and (2) A. Srikantappa, Dodballapur Municipality.

Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar.—(1) Once in every three months these Magistrates are changed. When the new set of Magistrates comes, even minor cases already tried by the other set of Magistrates are ordered to be tried *de novo*, which practice, I think is not necessary. There is no restriction in Criminal Procedure Code but High Courts have held Section 350 not applicable to Bench Courts.

Justice Mr. K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—These cases are summarily tried and evidence is not generally recorded, and as such it is desirable to try the case *de novo*.

Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar.—Whole evidence is recorded. There are no summary trials.

Third Member of Council.—Why not they go to the same Bench again?

Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar.—It is not possible. The period of tenure at least should be extended to one year or six months.

Mr. A. Srikantappa.—(2) It is very necessary that Bench courts must be invested with powers under Section 480 of the Criminal Procedure Code to try cases falling under Sections 175, 178, 179, 180 and 228 of the Indian Penal Code. Unless these powers are invested these courts will not be looked upon with respect. While Mr. Venkataramiah was a Chairman of the Dodaballapur

Bench court a case of disrespect to the court occurred and the Magistrate could not take any action since he was not invested with those powers. He had to apply to the Deputy Commissioner to deal with the man. Hence it is necessary that the Bench Courts should be invested with these powers.

Mr. Vema Reddi.—The present practice of changing the Magistrates once in 3 months may be changed to six months, in cases where the Magistrates are willing to continue, in which case there will not be much room for cases being tried *de novo* twice or thrice.

Mr. Hutchveeregowda.—If more powers are to be given to these magistrates, it must be thought twice before it is granted. Some of them are irresponsible men, and men who would like to take advantage to wreak vengence on their antagonists. It is better if police cases are not tried in these Bench Courts.

Third Member of Council.—Noted for consideration, in connection with the question of increasing the powers of Bench Magistrates.

SUBJECT No. 55.

Suits against Government.

Messrs. (1) Belur Srinivasa Iyengar, the Law Association, Bangalore; (2) H. Krishnasastry, Krishnarajpete Taluk; N. Rajagopala Iyengar, The Bar Association, Mysore; C. Narasimhaiya, Heggaddevankote Taluk; S. Krishnaswami Rao, Mysore Taluk; K. Venkatasamaiya, Mysore District Board, K. Narayan Rao, Nanjangud Municipality and E. Krishnappa and V. Bandaiya, Nanjangud Taluk.

Summary of Representation.—(1) The existing laws may be amended so as to confer the right of filing suits against Government in Civil Courts.

(2) The right of filing suits against Government which has been pending consideration for a very long time, may be definitely settled at an early date.

Note.—Before the member moved the subject, he was told by the Third Member of Council that the subject was being worked up and would be brought up before the next Legislative Council.

(*Vide.*—Also Dewan's concluding remarks in Appendix G.)

SUBJECT No. 56.

Fixing time limit for the disposal of Civil and Criminal cases.

Messrs. D. S. Mallappa, and G. K. Gurappa, Tiptur Taluk.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—There has been inordinate delay in the disposal of both criminal and civil suits in the Mysore Courts (cases of 1914-15 are pending) while in British India each case is to be disposed of in about 11 months. For instance Mrs. Annie Beasant's case was disposed of in about a week. By such delays lot of inconvenience is felt by the parties. In the execution of summonses also there is much difficulty. Unless the clerks of the courts are satisfied it would be difficult for the summonses to be issued. The same case applies to criminal cases as well. By this long delay the cases are entirely spoiled by the witnesses not appearing before the courts.

Whenever Government officers appear before Courts as witnesses they are given travelling allowance; while the non-officials appear no such concession is granted. I propose that Travelling Allowance may be allowed to non-officials who are called before courts as witnesses.